

TDC Blue Ribbon Committee  
February 6, 2008 Meeting Minutes Final

**Members Present:** ECOSLO- Maria Lorca; Templeton Area Advisory Group - Nicholas Marquart; Sierra Club – Susan Harvey; General Public – Melissa Boggs; City of San Luis Obispo – Kim Murry; Development Firm – Denis Sullivan; Subdivision Review Board, Air Pollution Control Board – Aeron Arlin Genet; Ag Liaison – Mark Pearce; Farm Bureau – Joy Fitzhugh; Land Conservancy – “BK” Bruce Richard; City of Paso Robles- Ron Whisenand; Active Agriculturalist – Charles Whitney

**Members Absent:** Subdivision Review Board, Public Works – Richard Marshall; Existing TDC receiver site – Chad Whittstrom; General Public - Christine Volbrecht ; ; South County Advisory Council - Jesse Hill

**Committee Staff Present:** Karen Nall and Kami Griffin, Planning and Building

**Others Present:** Lynda Auchinachie, Dorothy Jennings, Eric Greening, and Terry Simons

Aeron Arlin Genet is the facilitator in Richard Marshall absence and opens the meeting.

BK Richard provides a presentation on “The Givings Principal” and Land Banks. The following is an outline of the discussion.

- What is the cost of sprawl?
  - What’s the payoff from sprawl avoidance?
- What are the ingredients of successful TDC/TDR programs?
- What is The Givings Principle?
- What is a Land Transfer Bank?
  - How are Regions Of Interest Selected?
  - How are Sending Sites selected?
  - How are Receiving Sites selected?
- How do the cities play into this?
- How well could a Land Transfer Bank work out financially?
- How might a Land Transfer Bank get implemented?
- Next Steps
- A Blue Ribbon Committee Decision Tree

Group discussion ensues.

Discussion Expanded Definitions.

Aeron Arlin Genet begins the discussion on Agriculture and Rural Lands. Joy Fitzhugh notes that Mark Perce provided the definition. Mark Perce notes that compiled the definition using the existing language. Sue Harvey requests using a suggestion that Dorothy Jennings has. Maria Lorca clarifies and suggests using the definition of active agriculture that the Ag Department is working on to be used for the proposed revisions to the event ordinance. Joy Fitzhugh responds that the definition Maria is referring to is criteria. Mark Perce responds and clarifies that the criteria will be used as part of a certification process for events sites. He adds that we are looking for a much broader definition. Discussion ensues. Kami Griffin suggests that the definition is simply the following: Agricultural production lands consist of irrigated, dry land or grazing lands. Ron Whisenand raises concerns because he feels the definition does not include other agricultural uses including winery operation or tasting rooms. Discussion ensues regarding the goals of the program. Karen Nall notes that the goal for protection in the City’s Purple Belt includes wineries and tasting rooms. Ron Whisenand agrees. Kim Murry suggests that the City’s Purple Belt may be included in another category of “community separator”. Kami Griffin reads the

current definition “protect land with agriculture capability and the business of agriculture”. Karen Nall clarifies that the main reason the group wanted to expand the goal definitions was to clarify which antiquated subdivisions were worth saving and to add community separators as a new program goal. Discussion ensues.

Aeron Arlin Genet suggests going through the remaining items on the list but first reviewing the current ordinance language to see if it is sufficient. Aeron Arlin Genet requests the current language for natural Area and environmentally sensitive areas. Kami Griffin responds “protection of important or extraordinary natural areas, habitats or cultural resources, reduce development potential in areas with land slide, fire or other hazards, reduce air quality impact by limiting growth in outlying areas. Maria Lorca suggests using a handout provided by Dorothy Jennings. Aeron Arlin Genet refers to a definition Melissa Boggs provided at the last meeting. Melissa Boggs responds that she did revise the wording based on a suggestion from Dorothy Jennings. Kami Griffin reads the revised wording. Kami Griffin suggests using these expanded definitions for the criteria definitions when we discuss sending sites. Group agrees.

Kami Griffin agrees that “community separator” needs to be added to the overall program goals and a more narrowly defined definition of antiquated subdivisions. Dorothy Jennings states that lands along the Salinas River which should be included in the Natural Areas Plans have been subdivided using TDCs. Kami Griffin responds that there is a prohibition and receiver sites may not be located on land within the Natural Areas Plan. Sue Harvey suggests adding language to protect desert areas or outlying areas. Kami Griffin suggests adding general language to protect rural areas like California Valley.

Kim Murry provides the following three words on the boards: goals, definitions and criteria. She explains that the goal statement is readdressing what things the program is trying to protect and suggests that the goal statement include agreed upon labels. She adds that she does not believe that the goals statements should include paragraph long definitions. Kim Murry also clarifies that criteria is used to evaluate sending and receiving sites and that we are not discussing this today.

Melissa Boggs suggest that the Natural Areas Plans definition is not all inclusive. Aeron Arlin Genet questions whether the 5 goal topics listed on the agenda does confirm the program goals. Kami Griffin suggests looking back at the existing program goals. Maria Lorca questions how to add rural areas not just referring to lands zoned Rural Lands. Kami Griffin agrees a modification is needed to address outlying areas not just Rural Lands zonings. Kami Griffin explains the existing language that the first paragraph is the program goals and the second paragraph was an attempt to further define the goals. Kim Murry has a concern over the language “relocate development” and would like to modify the language to read modify development potential so it includes where development is retired and where credits may be used for things other than creation. Maria Lorca raises concerns regarding the language referring to retiring development potential. Kami Griffin states that she hears the group wants the goals to including natural areas and environmental sensitive land, land with agricultural capability and the business of agriculture itself, antiquated subdivisions that are currently intact, that have common ownership and have natural resources. Group agrees to delete natural resources. Kami Griffin continues goals including community separators, open space and outlying rural areas. Group discusses “rural areas” suggest using the word “remote”. Discussion ensues.

Kami Griffin provides the overall goal to read” Consistent with the applicable goals of the Land Use Element, the voluntary TDC program will retire development potential from is a voluntary program (may need to revise voluntary) for the protection of natural areas and environmental sensitive land, land with agricultural capability and the business of agriculture itself, community separators, antiquated

subdivisions that are currently intact and under common ownership and open space and outlying remote. Group agrees to review this goal in the minutes and review it at the next meeting.

Kami Griffin agrees to create the objective paragraph using the revised definitions and send to the group prior to the next meeting.

The minutes from October 3, 2007 and January 9, 2008 are approved by a motion by Maria Lorca seconded by Ron Whisenand.

Aeron Arlin Genet requests public comment.

Charlie Whitney comments on public comment and believes it should be restricted to the end of each agenda item.

Sue Harvey question whether underlying property owners consent is needed when completing specific plans. Kami Griffin and Ron Whisenand respond that participation is nice but not necessary. Sue Harvey and suggests adding public transportation as an issue of interest when studying specific plans.

Terry Simons provides a brief history zoning in the county and the LUO/LUE processes from 1981. Terry Simons agree that development should be encouraged within the urban areas. He question the goal is to protect agriculture. He suggests when preparing goals and definitions the group should take a good look at the over ridding public benefit and put credits into a dollars basis. He further comments concern about APCD and carbon balancing and suggests grapes are carbon scavengers and plants actually add oxygen and reducing carbon and any diesel pump or machinery used within a wine operation should be offset by the grape plants and they should actually get credit. Terry Simons is opposed to an upzoning buy out program.

Dorothy Jennings believes trucking grapes from Paso Robles to Arroyo Grande for processing will have a negative impact.

Next Meeting – February 20, 2008 at 3:00.